

OPEN AND SHUT?

Friday, February 10, 2012

John Wiley & Sons have no plans to endorse the Research Works Act

As opposition to the Research Works Act (RWA) grows, more and more scholarly publishers are distancing themselves from the proposed new bill. The latest is John Wiley & Sons.



Wiley has emailed me the following statement:

We do not believe that legislative initiatives are the best way forward at this time and so have no plans to endorse RWA. Instead we believe that research funder-publisher partnerships will be more productive.

Ongoing discussions with OSTP in the U.S., the Finch Group in the U.K. and research funders generally present an opportunity for research funders and publishers to work in partnership to develop tools to better identify, present and disseminate the results of publicly funded research – for example working together on initiatives to link published articles with funder information such as research reports, and finding new ways to manage and provide access to the rapidly expanding body of supporting research data as a critical reference tool for further scientific inquiry. At the same time, Wiley is actively exploring all sustainable business models for scholarly communication, including gold (funded) open access.

We believe this approach serves the interests of our diverse publishing partners (around 800 scholarly and professional societies), representing a broad range of opinion and policies on access.

Known formally as [HR 3699](#), the RWA is a proposed new bill that would reverse the [Public Access Policy](#) introduced in 2005 by the US National Institutes of Health (NIH). The policy requires that taxpayer-funded research is made freely accessible in the [National Library of Medicine's PubMed Central](#) database within 12 months of publication.

The RWA would also prevent other federal agencies from imposing similar mandates on their funded researchers. As such, it poses a serious threat to the Open Access (OA) movement.

The RWA is backed by the Association of American Publishers (AAP) and its Professional and Scholarly Division (PSP), which last December published a press release [describing](#) the bill as, "significant legislation that will help reinforce America's leadership in scholarly and scientific publishing in the public interest and in the critical peer-review system that safeguards the quality of such research."

However, since the beginning of January a growing number of publishers have been distancing themselves from the bill, including members of the AAP itself. Amongst those to do so are MIT Press, Pennsylvania State University Press, Rockefeller University Press, University of California Press, Nature Publishing Group, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAA), publisher of the well-known scientific journal *Science*.

John Wiley, we should note, is also a member of the AAP, and its technical, medical, and scholarly business Wiley-Blackwell is one of the larger scholarly

- Home
- About Richard Poynder
- Blog: *Open and Shut?*
- The State of Open Access
- The Basement Interviews
- Open Access Interviews
- Essays on Open Access
- Archive

Blogs, News & More:

Interview 1: Richard Poynder

Interview 2: Richard Poynder

Interview 3: Richard Poynder

DOAJ

BASE

LENS

Digital Koans

LSE Impact Blog

Heather Morrison

The Scholarly Kitchen

Open Access India

PLoS Blogs

Redalyc

SPARC Europe

IP Watchdog



Search This Blog

Popular Posts



Open Access: "Information wants to be free?" (A print version of this eBook is

available here) Earlier this year I was invited to discuss with Georgia Institute of Technology librarians...



P2P: The very core of the world to come In the first part of this interview Michel

Bauwens, the creator of The Foundation for P2P



Tweets by @RickyPo



Richard Poynder
@RickyPo

Pfizer, BioNTech, Moderna making \$1,000 profit every second: analysis
medicalxpress.com/news/2021-11-p...

Pfizer, BioNTech, ...
Pfizer, BioNTech an...
medicalxpress.com

6h



Richard Poynder
@RickyPo

A non-traditional open-source solution for altmetrics
emerald.com/insight/content...#paywalled

6h

The State of
Open Access
Predatory publishing
Institutional Repositories
Green OA Gold
OA Self-archiving
Copyright
Basement Interviews
OA Interviews

OA Essays Open
Access in Serbia
Open Access in
India **Open Access in**
Egypt **ScienceDirect**
Open Access
in California
OA in Latin
America **Open**
Access in the Humanities
MDPI Preprints **Selecting**
Reviewers **Global**
Research
Council OA Big
Deal **Open**
Notebook **Science**
Elsevier **Gates**
Foundation OA in
South Africa **OA in**
France **SSRN OA &**
the Humanities
Timothy Gowers **Harold**
Varmus **Peter**
Suber **OA in Poland**
OA Embargoes
Big Deal **Finch**
Report **Jeffrey Beall**
ALPSP OA
Mandates **PLOS**
Peer Review
Springer **BioMed**
Central **Free**
Software **Digital**
Preservation **Dove**
Medical OA in Russia
Radical OA **Almost OA**
HEFCE **Frontiers**

publishers. [Wiley Online Library](#) offers online access to over 4 million articles from 1,500 journals, 9,000+ books, and many reference works and databases.

As the list of RWA dissenters grows, OA advocate Peter Suber has been keeping tabs on a [wiki page](#) he has created at Harvard's Berkman Center. In a Google+ post yesterday, Suber [reported](#) that there are now "19 publisher opponents of RWA and 46 major non-publisher opponents." John Wiley will take the number of dissenting publishers to 20.

Further bad news for RWA supporters came yesterday, when it was [announced](#) that a [new version](#) of the Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) has been introduced into both the House and the Senate.

The FRPAA is the exact opposite of the RWA: Where the RWA would roll back the NIH Public Access Policy, the FRPAA would strengthen it – by reducing the maximum embargo period before published research papers have to be made freely available online from 12 months to six months.

And where the RWA would outlaw other US federal agencies from imposing NIH-like mandates on their funded researchers, the FRPAA would require all the major agencies of the federal government to introduce the new strengthened policy.

[More on the FRPAA here.](#)

Posted by Richard Poynder at [09:41](#)



Labels: [Research Works Act](#), [Wiley](#)

1 comment:

Anonymous said...

Open access has nothing to do with the RWA. The RWA only serves to protect copyrights that publishers rightfully own. Open access articles will always be open access regardless of legislation. The question is, are researchers prepared to pay to publish, rather than pay to read? If yes, then gold open access is the answer, which Wiley and even Elsevier have started to introduce. The problem is double dipping, that is, libraries still paying for subscriptions while authors pay to publish. Libraries are the ones that should place embargoes on subscriptions and pass on the money to academics in their institutions so they can publish open access. This measure could overnight force all journals to become open access. Who will be the first brave (top) university to do so?

February 10, 2012 5:59 pm

[Post a Comment](#)

[Newer Post](#)

[Home](#)

[Older Post](#)

Subscribe to: [Post Comments \(Atom\)](#)

Alternatives , explained why he believes the var...



PLOS CEO
Alison Mudditt discusses new OA agreement with the University of

[California](#)

The Public Library of Science (PLOS) and the University of California (UC) have today announced a two-year agreement designed to make...



The Open Access Interviews:
Publisher MDPI Headquartered in Basel,

Switzerland, the Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, or more usually MDPI , is an open access publisher...



The OA Interviews:
Taylor & Francis' Deborah Kahn discusses Dove

[Medical Press](#)

Please note the postscript to this interview here The open-access publisher Dove Medical Press has a controversial past and I have writ...



Copyright: the
immoveable barrier that open access advocates underestimated

In calling for research papers to be made freely available open access advocates promised that doing so would lead to a simpler, less cos...



The Open Access Interviews:
OMICS Publishing Group's Srinu

[Babu Gedela](#)

***Update: On August 26th 2016, the US government (Federal Trade Commission) announced that it has charged OMICS with making false claims, ...



Robin Osborne
on the state of Open Access: Where are we, what still needs to be done?

One of a series exploring the current state of Open Access (OA), the Q&A below is with Robin Osborne , Professor of Ancient History a...



Community Action Publishing:
Broadening the Pool

We are today seeing growing dissatisfaction with the pay-to-publish model